



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,471	12/21/2001	Alex Apollonsky	002659.P016	9953

7590 08/10/2004

THE PROCTOR & GAMBLE CO.  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
Winton Hill Technical Center - Box 161  
6110 Center Hill Avenue  
Cincinnati, OH 45224

EXAMINER
----------

ORTIZ, BELIX M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/027,471

Applicant(s)

APOLLONSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Belix M. Ortiz

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-177 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34, 50-51, 58-93, 109-110, 117-152, 168-169, 176-177 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 35-49, 52-57, 94-108, 111-116, 153-167, 170-175 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3, 5, 18, 29, 58-59, 62, 64, 77, 88, 117-118, 121, 123, 136, 147, and 176-177

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 3, 18, 29, 62, 77, 88, 121, 136, and 147 the phrase "may be" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Regarding claims 58-59, 117-118 and 176-177 the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Regarding claims 5, 64, and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being dependent from rejected dependent claims 3, 62, and 121.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-34, 50-51, 58-93, 109-110, 117-152, 168-169, and 176-177 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookman et al.

(U.S. publication 2003/0050929) in view of Dey et al. (U.S. publication 2003/0061028).

As to claims 1, 60, and 119, Bookman et al. teaches a method comprising:  
maintaining a library of information (see page 2, paragraph 37);  
reading metadata tagged information about a user's work profile and  
working context and content within the library of information (see page 1,  
paragraph 8); and

matching the metadata tagged information about content within the library  
of information to metadata tagged information about one or more of the user's  
work profile, the user's working context, or other content within the library of  
information using one or more programmable rules (see page 1, paragraphs 9  
and 12).

Bookman et al. does not teach delivering to the user a rank ordered set of  
the most contextually relevant content from the library of information based on  
the matching of the metadata tagged information.

Dey et al. teaches a tool for automatically mapping multimedia annotations to ontologies (see abstract), in which he teaches delivering to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information based on the matching of the metadata tagged information (see page 5, claim 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bookman et al., to include delivering to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information based on the matching of the metadata tagged information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bookman et al. by the teaching of Dey et al., because delivering to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information based on the matching of the metadata tagged information, would enable the method to display to the user the most important information at the first time the user request an information and it will be easy and fast to the user find the information that match with the input tag.

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 2, 61, and 120, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein matching comprises:

defining one or more rules to determine a subset of the information to be searched based on the metadata tagged information about the user's work profile and working context (see Bookman et al., page 1, paragraphs 9 and 12);

generating a set of queries for searching the library of information based on the set of rules (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 37); and

invoking the rules based on the user's working context (see Bookman et al., abstract).

As to claims 3, 62, and 121, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein maintaining a library of information comprises:

receiving user input indicating materials that are determined to be useful (see Bookman et al., page 4, paragraph 67);

receiving input regarding tasks for which the materials determined to be useful may be utilized (see Bookman et al., page 4, paragraph 67);

generating content for the library of information comprising the materials determined to be useful and the tasks for which the materials may be utilized (see Bookman et al., page 4, paragraph 67);

receiving user input to make the content uniform with other information in the library of information (see Bookman et al., page 5, paragraph 87);

generating a display version of the content (see Bookman et al., page 4, paragraph 80); and

inserting metadata tags into the content, the metadata tags indicating the type of information present in the content and the tasks for which the material may be utilized (see Bookman et al., page 4, paragraph 80).

As to claims 4, 63, and 122, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein delivering to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information is further based on the matching of a series of weighted values associated with the metadata (see Dey et al., see page 5, claim 1).

As to claims 5, 64, and 123, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein generating a display version of the content comprises generating a Hyper-text Markup Language (HTML) version of the content (see Bookman et al., page 5, paragraphs 91 and page 7, paragraph 128).

As to claims 6, 65, and 124, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the content within the library of information comprises documents and metadata (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraphs 27 and 37).

As to claims 7, 66, and 125, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the content within the library of information comprises applications and metadata (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraphs 27 and 37).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 8, 67, and 126, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the content within the library of information comprises documents, applications, and metadata (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraphs 27 and 37).

As to claims 9, 68, and 127, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the documents comprise digital assets (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 37).

As to claims 10, 69, and 128, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the documents comprise Uniform Resource Locator (URL) links (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 35, where “Uniform Resource Locator” is read on “Hyperlink”).

As to claims 11, 70, and 129, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the documents comprise physical asset references (see Bookman et al., page 8, paragraph 149, document deemed to include all documents including physical asset references).

As to claims 12, 71, and 130, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the applications comprise programmable wizards and web- forms (see Bookman et al., page 7, paragraph 139).



Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 13, 72, and 131, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the content of the web form can be authored to present various graphical interfaces and be stored and modified in a transactional database (see Bookman et al., page 6, paragraph 103 and page 7, paragraph 128).

As to claims 14, 73, and 132, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the one or more programmable rules define a functional mapping of the metadata tagged information about a user's work profile and working context to the library of information (see Bookman et al., page 1, paragraphs 8, 9 and 12).

As to claims 15, 74, and 133, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the one or more programmable rules allow the metadata tagged information about a user's work profile and working context, and content within the library of information to have varying weight (see Bookman et al., page 4, paragraph 77 and page 6, paragraph 113).

As to claims 16, 75, and 134, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the programmable rules support programmable clauses, keywords, hurdles, and operators (see Bookman et al., page 1, paragraph 94 and page 6, paragraph 120).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 17, 76, and 135, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the one or more programmable rules are predefined (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 27 and page 4, paragraph 77).

As to claims 18, 77, and 136, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the one or more programmable rules may be complemented or replaced (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 27 and page 4, paragraph 77).

As to claims 19, 78, and 137, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein matching comprises hard metadata matches, soft metadata matches, or a combination of hard metadata matches and soft metadata matches (see Bookman et al., page 6, paragraph 113).

As to claims 20, 79, and 138, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein hard metadata matches comprise matching specific metadata fields (see Bookman et al., page 7, paragraphs 124 and 133).

As to claims 21, 80, and 139, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein soft metadata matches comprise matching keywords in text descriptions of the content within the library of information (see Bookman et al., abstract; page 2, paragraph 37 and page 5, paragraph 94).

As to claims 22, 81, and 140, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein delivering to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information comprises presenting a dashboard area that aggregates a variety of metadata, content, and applications based on the user's working context (see Dey et al., page 5, claim 1).

As to claims 23, 82, and 141, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the dashboard comprises a project dashboard that presents relevant content based on the user's project context when the user is focusing on a specific project (see Bookman et al., page 4, paragraph 81).

As to claims 24, 83, and 142, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the dashboard comprises a task dashboard that presents relevant content based on the user's task context when the user is focusing on a specific task (see Dey et al., page 5, claim 1).

As to claims 25, 84, and 143, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the dashboard comprises a sub-task dashboard that presents relevant content based on the user's sub-task context when the user is focusing on a specific sub-task (see Dey et al., page 5, claim 1).

As to claims 26, 85, and 144, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the dashboard comprises a file dashboard that presents relevant content based

Art Unit: 2175

on the user focusing on a specific file in the library of information (see Dey et al., page 5, claim 1).

As to claims 27, 86, and 145, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the dashboard comprises a folder dashboard that presents relevant content based on the user focusing on a specific folder in the library of information (see Dey et al., page 5, claim 1).

As to claims 28, 87, and 146, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein maintaining a library of information comprises organizing content into a hierarchy of personal, team, company, and industry-wide levels (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 37, library of data deemed to include all types of data).

As to claims 29, 88, and 147, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein each level of the hierarchy and various combinations of levels of the hierarchy may be used as source or target locations for content of the library of information (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 35, where "level" is read on "layer" and page 7, paragraph 125, the hierarchy links deemed to be included in links).

As to claims 30, 89, and 148, Bookman et al. as modified teaches further comprising, for each level of the hierarchy, delivering to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information based

Art Unit: 2175

on the matching of the metadata tagged information (see Dey et al., page 5, claim 1).

As to claims 31, 90, and 149, Bookman et al. as modified teaches further comprising providing metadata and a content link to a print-friendly version of the specific material (see Bookman et al., page 7, paragraph 139, metadata deemed to be print friendly).

As to claims 32, 91, and 150, Bookman et al. as modified teaches further comprising providing metadata and a content link to a downloadable version of the specific material (see Bookman et al., page 3, paragraph 59 and page 7, paragraph 139).

As to claims 33, 92, and 151, Bookman et al. as modified teaches further comprising providing metadata and a content link to an online version of the specific material (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraphs 26 and 41; page 3, paragraph 56; and page 7, paragraph 125).

As to claims 34, 93, and 152, Bookman et al. as modified teaches further comprising controlling access privileges of users, groups, and domains that are able to view, edit, create, or delete the metadata tagged information and the One Or more programmable rules (see Bookman et al., page 6, paragraph 118 and page 7, paragraph 124).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 50, 109, and 168, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein a user repository containing the library of information may reside fully in a centralized database or at a customer location (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 33).

As to claims 51, 110, and 169, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the user repository, if located at a customer location, is synchronized with the centralized database and its user records on an initial and ongoing basis (see Bookman et al., page 1, paragraph 12 and page 7, paragraph 133).

As to claims 58, 117, and 176, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the documents comprise office documents such as Microsoft Word documents, spreadsheets or presentations (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 27, deemed to include all document types).

As to claims 59, 118, and 177, Bookman et al. as modified teaches wherein the documents comprise rich media content such as text, images, audio, video and interactive media (see Bookman et al., page 2, paragraph 37).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 35-49, 52-57, 94-108, 111-116, 153-167, and 170-175 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, Bookman et al. (U.S. publication 2003/0050929) and Dey et al. (U.S. publication 2003/0061028) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein the one or more programmable rules each have a unique identifier (rule ID), a name, and a set of clauses defining the operations of that rule, as claimed in claims 35, 94, and 153.

Claims 36-49, 52-57, 95-108, 111-116, 154-167, and 170-175 are objected to as being dependent from the objected to dependent claim 35.

Art Unit: 2175

**Conclusion**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Belix M. Ortiz whose telephone number is 703-305-7605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

bmo

July 23, 2004.



**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**